

REMARKS

In the Action dated June 3, 2009, the Examiner indicated that Claim 2 was allowable if incorporated into Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 2 and 1 were combined in the Response filed June 17, 2009. Also, Claim 3 was amended to correct the dependency from both Claims 1 and 2 so that it now only depends from Claim 1. Claim 2 was canceled and Claims 4-9 were canceled.

In the Action the Examiner indicated that the device claims should be canceled. The device claims are 4-8. The Examiner also indicated that Claim 9 should be canceled. This is respectfully believed to be an error, since Claim 9 is a method claim that depended from a method claim. Claim 9 should be allowable since it is not a device claim and depended from a claim that was indicated as being allowable.

Therefore, by way of this Supplemental Amendment, new Claim 10 is being added to the claim set and is identical to previously canceled Claim 9, which Applicant believes should have been indicated as allowable. Consideration is respectfully requested.

Only subject matter that has been indicated as being allowable is pending in the application. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2009

/Steven B. Courtright/
Michael H. Baniak, Reg. No. 30,608
Steven B. Courtright, Reg. No. 40,966

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312.913.0001